DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 371 081 UD 029 918

AUTHOR Morse, Ann
TITLE America's Newcomers: Employment and Training Programs for Immigrants and Refugees. Issue Paper No. 3. Immigrant Policy Project.
INSTITUTION National Conference of State Legislatures, Denver, CO.
SPONS AGENCY Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, New York, N.Y.
REPORT NO ISBN-1-55516-927-9
PUB DATE Oct 93
NOTE 24p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Disadvantaged Youth; Employment; Ethnic Groups; *Federal Programs; *Government Role; *Immigrants; Job Training; *Labor Force Development; Labor Market; Minority Groups; Needs Assessment; Policy Formation; Program Descriptions; Public Policy; *Refugees; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS Immigration Reform and Control Act 1986; Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Program; *Job Training Partnership Act 1982

ABSTRACT

Realities of a multilingual, multiethnic workforce and the services available in the current employment and training system are discussed in this report, which outlines the main Federal programs that provide employment and training for the foreign-born. Also highlighted are issues raised by participants in the Immigrant Policy Project's regional meetings in 1992-93. The main Federal programs that provide employment and training services are the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) for disadvantaged adults and youth and the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) program. Participation by immigrants is hard to track, because these programs track participants by ethnicity. Two programs within the Department of Health and Human Services, the State Legalization Impact Assistance Grants and the Office of Refugee Resettlement, also provide employment, job training, and educational services for immigrants and aliens legalized under the Immigration Reform and Control Act. These and other programs reflect the projection that immigrants will become a significant proportion of the nation's workforce. Programs that have been successful should become the basis for additional efforts to meet the needs of the growing immigrant population. (Contains 28 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 371 081

AMERICA'S NEWCOMERS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
G. Goos
National Conference Statelegislatures
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: UD
In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. CE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Employment and Training Programs for Immigrants and Refugees

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD029915

AMERICA'S NEWCOMERS:

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR IMMIGRANTS AND REFUGEES

Issue Paper No. 3

Immigrant Policy Project
State and Local Coalition on Immigration

by

Ann Morse

National Conference of State Legislatures
William T. Pound, Executive Director

1560 Broadway, Suite 700
Denver, Colorado 80302

444 N. Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 515
Washington, D.C. 20001

October 1993

Copyright ©1993 by the National Conference of State Legislatures. All rights reserved.
ISBN 1-55516-927-9

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements v

I. Introduction 1

II. Federal Programs for Employment and Job Training 2

A. The Job Training Partnership Act of 1982 (JTPA) 2
JTPA in Brief 3
Evaluations of JTPA 4
Performance Standards 4

B. Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program (JOBS) 5
Implementation Issues 5
JOBS in Brief 6
Evaluations 6

III. Immigrant and Refugee Programs 7

A. HHS State Legalization Impact Assistance Grants (SLIAG) 7
SLIAG in Brief 7

B. HHS Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) 8
1. Social Services 9
2. Targeted Assistance Program 9
3. Demonstration Programs and Discretionary Projects 10
a. Wilson-Fish Demonstration Projects 10
b. National Discretionary Projects 10

IV. Discussion 11

V. Conclusions 14

Sources 17

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This issue paper was produced by the Immigrant Policy Project of the State and Local Coalition on Immigration, a collaboration of five national organizations representing state and local government:

American Public Welfare Association
National Association of Counties
National Conference of State Legislatures
National Governors' Association
United States Conference of Mayors

The Immigrant Policy Project is funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to address the role of state and local governments in the resettlement of refugees and immigrants. Through survey research, a series of regional meetings with state and local officials, and a series of issue papers such as this, the project seeks to document immigration trends, innovative policies and programs, and priorities for state and local government. Other issue papers examine immigration trends and their effect on state and local government; health care issues for newcomers; and community relations.

This paper has benefited from the insight, advice, and technical expertise of many state and local officials and immigration specialists. The project is particularly grateful to our expert panel for their comments. Thanks are also due to the members and staff of the project's National Advisory Board for providing focus, to Stephanie Bell-Rose for providing guidance, and to a countless number of researchers and labor specialists who assisted in providing both background research and specific examples and recommendations for the paper. Edits and comments were provided by Michael Bird, Scott Liddell, David Shreve, and Sheri Steisel.

By the year 2000, nearly one-fourth of new workers will be immigrants—U.S. Department of Labor

I. INTRODUCTION

The topic of immigrants and jobs usually leads to controversy, with opponents of immigration stating that immigrants take jobs and displace American workers and depress their wages, while proponents believe immigrants create jobs and markets. A number of researchers have explored the issue of labor market effects of immigration. In a recent review of fiscal studies on immigration, Rothman and Espenshade found that, "Sometimes the consequences for natives' earnings and employment are negative and sometimes they are positive, but in almost all instances the effects are weak or insignificant."[1]

The focus of this report is not, however, to debate the impacts of immigrants on the labor market, but to discuss the reality of a multilingual, multiethnic workforce and the services available in the current employment and training system. The issue for state and local policymakers is how to assist these legal residents, admitted by federal law, to become productive members of their adopted communities and to contribute to the nation's goal of a competitive workforce.

Trends in federal programs and in the demographics of immigrants are leading to an increasing gap in services at a time of increasing need. Federal job training programs (JTPA and JOBS) serve a small percentage of the eligible population, and the few targeted programs for refugees and immigrants have endured drastic funding reductions and delays. At the same time, language and literacy barriers reduce access to these programs for refugees and immigrants.

A growing proportion of the U.S. immigrant population has limited English skills and a low level of schooling. In a November 1989 Census survey, 24 percent of immigrants aged 16 and older reported that they spoke only English at home; 45 percent spoke another language and spoke English well; and the remaining 32 percent spoke English "not well" or "not at all." Immigrants also tend to fall along educational extremes: although a little more than one-fourth of new immigrants are college graduates, about one-fourth have attended less than nine years of school.

Demographers project continuing high levels of immigration. Approximately 1 million immigrants enter the United State each year: 480,000 arrivals through family visas, 140,000 arrivals through worker visas, and 55,000 through special "diversity" visas; approximately 120,000 refugees and an estimated 200,000 undocumented immigrants enter and remain in the United States. Most of the 140,000 worker visas are provided to those with "extraordinary ability," professionals with advanced degrees, skilled workers, special immigrants (such as religious workers), and investors.

Immigrants currently make up 8 percent (14.9 million) of the nation's workforce. Of the 14.9 million, 6 million are Hispanic, 3.1 million Asian, 4.8 million white non-Hispanic, 0.9 million black, and 0.1 other. The U.S. Department of Labor projects that immigrants will comprise nearly one-fourth of new workers by the year 2000 (due to demographic trends such as a low U.S. birthrate and the aging of the population).

This report outlines the main federal programs that provide employment and training services, and examples of successful programs that serve the foreign-born. The report also highlights issues raised by participants of the Immigrant Policy Project's regional meetings convened in 1992-1993.

[1] Rothman, Eric S. and Espenshade, Thomas J. "Fiscal Impacts of Immigration to the United States," *Population Index*, (Princeton, N.J.) Fall 1992, Vol. 58, No. 3.

II. Federal Programs for Employment and Job Training

The main federal programs that provide employment and training services are the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) for disadvantaged adults and youth and the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) program, a welfare-to-work program. However, participation rates in these programs by immigrants is difficult to ascertain: programs track use by ethnicity, not by immigration status per se. Two programs within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services also provide employment, job training and educational services for specific immigrant populations (for refugees and aliens legalized under the Immigration Reform and Control Act [IRCA]).

A. The Job Training Partnership Act of 1982 (JTPA)

JTPA is the largest system of federal job training programs, funded at approximately $4 billion through the U.S. Department of Labor. The programs serve economically disadvantaged adults and youth, older workers, dislocated workers, migrant and seasonal farmworkers, Native Americans, and others who face significant employment barriers. Participation is open to U.S. citizens, lawful permanent residents, refugees, asylees and parolees, those legalized under IRCA, and individuals authorized by the U.S. attorney general to work in the United States.

The JTPA program was amended in 1992 in an attempt to better serve those with the greatest need, by designating target groups with barriers to employment. At least 65 percent of those served must fall in one or more of the listed target groups (including those deficient in basic skills, e.g., English, reading, or computing skills at or below the 8th grade level; school dropouts; welfare recipients, etc.). Local areas may add one additional target group.

Services include 1) direct training and 2) training related and supportive services. Direct training includes basic skills, on-the-job training (OJT), assessment and counseling, education-to-work transition activities, bilingual training, and customized training. Training-related and support services include job search assistance, outreach, and services to enable participation in the program, such as child care. The amendment added as an allowable activity bilingual training and outreach for individuals with limited proficiency in English. Local areas must provide an assessment of skill levels and service needs of each participant, develop individual service strategies, review individual progress, and refer to appropriate training and services. Funds are authorized at a 10 percent increase each year to expand services. Technical assistance funds are available to support replication of successful programs

Linkages. Local job training programs are required to establish appropriate linkages with other federally authorized programs, such as the Carl Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, JOBS, food stamps, the National Literacy Act, and Head Start, as well as appropriate state and local educational agencies, community organizations, and other training, employment, and social service programs. The 1992 amendments also authorize states to establish a single Human Resource Investment Council for JTPA, Carl Perkins, Adult Education, Wagner-Peyser, JOBS and food stamp employment and training programs.

Migrant workers. According to the National Commission for Employment Policy, the federal government spends $600 million annually on 13 programs that provide education, training, and health care for migrant and seasonal farmworkers, most of whom are foreign-born. (Four programs account for 88 percent of the funds: migrant education, migrant health, the JTPA farmworker program, and Migrant Head Start.) The commission notes a lack of coordination in eligibility criteria and grouping of services for the migrant population. A 1992 commission report recommends that government agencies improve coordination of their policies and programs to deliver a comprehensive set of services, and to develop a common framework for streamlining eligibility requirements.

JTPA in Brief

"It is the purpose of this Act to establish programs to prepare youth and adults facing serious barriers to employment for participation in the labor force by providing job training and other services that will result in increased employment and earnings, increased educational and occupational skills, and decreased welfare dependency, thereby improving the quality of the workforce and enhancing the productivity and competitiveness of the Nation." Job Training Reform Amendments of 1992, P.L. 102-367.

JTPA includes programs for disadvantaged adults and youth (Title II, $1.8 billion, plus a summer program for youth, funded at approximately $700 million); dislocated workers (Title III, $577 million); federally administered programs such as for migrant and seasonal farmworkers ($77 million), Job Corps ($955 million), veterans, and the National Commission for Employment Policy (all in Title IV).

Disadvantaged adults and youth (Title II). In FY 1991, an estimated $1.8 billion was spent for training of 721,000 disadvantaged adults and youth, serving approximately 5-10 percent of the eligible population. The summer employment and training program for youth provides remedial education, classroom and on-the-job training, and work experience at the minimum wage. Approximately $700 million has been available annually, serving about 600,000 youth.

Dislocated workers (Title III). JTPA includes a $577 million program for dislocated workers, designed to assist those who have recently lost their jobs due to mass layoffs or plant closings. Others eligible under this program include long-term unemployed people with limited local opportunities for jobs in their fields; farmers, ranchers or self-employed individuals who become jobless due to general economic conditions or natural disasters Services include retraining (classroom and on-the-job training, remedial education including literacy or ESL), and readjustment training (assessment, career counseling, job placement, job development and supportive services).

Administration of Titles II and III. These programs are administered largely at the local level. General policy guidance is provided by the State Job Training Coordinating Council, appointed by the governor, and composed of representatives of business, state and local government, organized labor, community based organizations, and the general public. The governor establishes "Service Delivery Areas" (SDAs) to receive job training funds. Within each SDA, local officials and Private Industry Councils (PICs) are partners in developing and implementing the job training program. PICs consist of representatives from the private sector, educational agencies, organized labor, community based organizations, and public assistance agencies. 77 percent of the Title II-A (adult training) funds to states are allocated to the SDA/PICs (the core program). The remaining 23 percent is earmarked: 5 percent for state administration, 8 percent for basic education and coordination, 5 percent for older workers, and 5 percent for service delivery areas that exceed their performance standards, or for technical assistance activities. One hundred percent of Title II-B (summer youth), 82 percent of Title II-C (youth training), and 50 percent of Title III are allocated to SDAs.

Migrant workers (Title IV). Section 402 of JTPA provides the principal federal training program for migrant farmworkers. The program is funded at $77 million for 1992 and serves approximately 55,000 farmworkers and their dependents, or 2 percent of the eligible population. Services include adult and basic education, ESL, on-the-job training, counseling, and support services (including day care, health care, legal aid, transportation). Support services are limited to 15 percent of funds.

Job Corps (Title IV) is a federally administered residential education and vocational training program for at-risk youth, aged 16-24. Originally established as part of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Job Corps is a partnership of federal government, organized labor and private industry, volunteer and national nonprofit advocacy organizations. Funded at $955 million, Job Corps provides comprehensive services: basic education, vocational training, health care, counseling, support services, and cultural awareness classes. The program serves approximately 68,000 youth each year who are poor, school dropouts and either unemployed or not in the labor force (reaching approximately 2 percent of those in need).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Job Corps is a residential educational and vocational training program for at-risk youth. While it does not keep data specifically on immigrant status, it does measure program use through five major ethnic groups. In San Francisco, for example, approximately 33 percent of the students are Hispanic, 25 percent black, 24 percent white, 10 percent Asian-Pacific Islander, and 5-6 percent American Indian. Job Corps has developed a national curriculum with materials in 23 languages; English language classes are provided at each center. The average length of the program for an individual is 10 months. It is an open-entry, open-exit program; enrollees are self-paced for advancement. In San Francisco, the current waiting list to enter the program is over 1,000.

Evaluations of JTPA

In 1991, the General Accounting Office (GAO) reported that services differ by demographic group: white participants were more likely than minorities to receive classroom training and on-the-job training; minorities were more likely to receive only job search assistance. Participants receiving classroom training have the highest average placement wage upon completing training; job search assistance alone resulted in the lowest average placement wage.[2]

According to the GAO, several factors contribute to disparities in services provided to minorities: financial incentives in performance-based contracts that value the number of participants trained or placed in jobs (not the benefit to the participant); the lack of an independent and comprehensive assessment process; the lack of support services such as child care and transportation; and the discriminatory actions of some employers.

The GAO report stated, "in the case of minorities and women, service providers tend to steer them toward low-skilled, low-wage jobs because that is the easiest way to achieve performance benchmarks and receive payments under their performance-based contracts." Also, many providers "offer traditional, stereotypical training because it is inexpensive to set up, jobs are plentiful, and most participants can easily complete the training."

A 1992 evaluation of JTPA (Title II-A) indicated that JTPA had generally positive effects on earnings and employment of adults, but little or no effect on female youths, and substantial negative effects on male youths. JTPA did not appear to benefit Hispanics; their post-training earnings were lower regardless of age or gender.[3]

GAO reported that support services for JTPA need to be improved. The June 1992 report noted that participants who received child care support were more successful in completing training and finding jobs. However, only 9 percent of SDA funds were spent on support services.

Performance Standards

JTPA has been criticized in the past for "creaming" the most employable people and screening out those who are harder to serve in order to meet performance standards that rewarded high job placements. For example, minimum entry requirements for certain programs often limited access for those with limited English skills, excluding those with less than a sixth grade education. The system rewarded short programs and quick job placement rather than improved skills for the student.

The 1992 JTPA amendments directed DOL, in consultation with DOE and HHS, to prescribe performance standards based on factors including placement and job retention for six months in unsubsidized employment, increased earnings, reduction in welfare dependency, and acquisition of skills. Governors may prescribe variations in the standards based upon

---

[2]GAO, *Job Training Partnership Act: Racial and Gender Disparities in Services*, GAO/HRD-91-148, September 1991.

[3]"The National JTPA Study: Title II-A Impacts on Earnings and Employment at 18 Months," Abt Associates Inc., Bethesda, Md. (May 1992).

economic, geographic and demographic factors in the state. States must make efforts to increase services and positive outcomes for hard-to-serve individuals.

The JTPA program in Yuma, Ariz., implemented a pilot program months before the 1992 amendments in order to better provide for the "hard to serve." Clients who are monolingual Spanish, limited English proficient, or functioning below a fifth grade level may enter the Educational Opportunities Center to reach language, literacy and basic education levels that will enable them to undertake vocational training. Despite this and other efforts, local administrators estimate only 5 percent of the demand in Yuma County is met.

A JTPA-funded program that has been praised for its success with the "hard to serve" is the Center for Employment Training (CET), a community-based organization in San Jose, Calif. CET combines practical occupational training for all participants in an open-entry, open-exit setting. No minimum educational level is required for enrollment. English as a Second Language and basic remediation are provided as needed within the vocational training. A Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., evaluation of CET found that participants with the greatest barriers to employment derived the greatest benefit from participation.

It should be noted that evaluation of JTPA programs is difficult because of the latitude localities have to design programs to fit the unique needs of the community. Federal funds are distributed to states, who must pass through most of the funds to localities (SDAs). Each SDA decides where funds are allocated, the programs offered, and therefore what kinds of clients will be served. Programs, services, and administrative structures thus vary from area to area.

B. Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program (JOBS)

Created by the Family Support Act of 1988, the JOBS program is a "welfare-to-work" program for recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children. The program provides employment, education, and job training to assist poor families with children become self-sufficient. Eligibility is open to citizens, legal permanent residents, those "permanently residing in the United States under color of law" (PRUCOL), such as conditional entrants, asylees, refugees, or parolees.

Eligibility for certain aliens has been decided by the courts because AFDC regulations do not define PRUCOL beyond categories specified by Congress. *Holley vs. Lavine* extended eligibility for those residing under "official permission or discretion." *Sudomir vs. McMahon* refused eligibility for a pending asylum applicant, as the applicant had only the possibility of residence, not official authorization, express or implied. Legalized people under IRCA were barred from accessing AFDC (and thus JOBS) for five years after they were granted temporary resident status. The five-year bar phased out in May 1993.

Implementation Issues

In FY 1992, states spent approximately two-thirds of the $1 billion appropriation. States were unable to draw down the full appropriation because tight state budgets precluded raising the required matching funds. Only 11 states claimed their full allocation of federal JOBS funds. States spent $437 million on JOBS-related child care. GAO reported in September 1991 that states have shortages of services such as basic and remedial education (especially in rural areas) and that two-thirds of the states have shortages in child care and transportation.

Regulations. The "100-hour rule" mandates that an AFDC primary wage earner, such as a JOBS participant lose benefits if he or she exceeds 100 hours of work per month.

Demonstrations authorized by HHS are under way in California, Wisconsin, and Utah to test a definition of unemployment easier to meet than the 100-hour rule. (A California refugee demonstration project found that waiving the

JOBS in Brief

Funding

JOBS is a capped entitlement. Funds are available to states at a match rate up to the overall JOBS funding cap, authorized at $1 billion for federal FY 1993; $1.1 billion in 1994; $1.3 billion in 1995; and $1 billion thereafter.

Target groups

The JOBS program requires that a minimum percentage of the AFDC population be served. In 1993, 11 percent of the nonexempt AFDC caseload must participate in JOBS in any given month, rising to 15 percent in 1994, and 20 percent in 1995. JOBS also requires that 55 percent of JOBS funds be spent on target groups, such as teen parents and long-term welfare recipients (defined as families on assistance for more than 36 months). (States that do not meet both requirements lose the ability to claim enhanced federal match for JOBS.)

Services

States must offer the following: education, job skills training, job readiness, job development and job placement, and supportive services such as child care. Educational services include literacy, remedial education, ESL, and assistance in obtaining a high school diploma or the equivalent. States are also required to offer two of these four activities: group and individual job search; on-the-job training; work supplementation programs; or community work experience. Child care funds for JOBS participants are available under a separate, open-ended entitlement at the Medicaid match rate. (Transitional child care is also available for 12 months after the parent stops receiving AFDC.) Transportation and other work-related costs are reimbursed at 50 percent and apply to the JOBS cap.

Administration

At the federal level, JOBS is managed by the Administration on Children and Families in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. States administer JOBS through the welfare agency. The state office may provide services directly or contract with JTPA administrative entities, state and local education agencies, and other public or private organizations, including community-based organizations.

100-hour rule increased the level of job entries, but it may not be a major factor in reducing welfare dependency.) The "20-hour rule" requires participants to engage in 20 hours of program activity a week to be counted toward a state's required participation rate, but most educational programs require only 12-18 classroom hours.

Evaluations

Since JOBS was implemented so recently, few studies have yet been conducted on the effectiveness of the program, and no research is available that measures specific immigrant participation in the program. The following evaluations are provided to give an indication of the potential success of JOBS and the extent to which minorities access and benefit from employment and training programs.

Preliminary results of a study of six counties in the California GAIN program (a precursor of the national JOBS program), indicates that the program is successful in achieving higher earnings for participants and lowering state expenditures on welfare. The Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation reported

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

that the average single parent participant earned 21 percent more than a welfare recipient in a control group; welfare savings averaged 6 percent.[4]

MDRC notes that a key feature of the program is the use of educational and basic skills levels to place participants in two different tracks: those without a high school diploma, fail to achieve a certain math and literacy level, or are not proficient in English, are placed in basic education classes. Those who are judged not to need basic education must usually participate in job search first. Participants already in approved education and training programs when they enter GAIN may continue in those programs.

In a review of 1980s welfare-to-work programs, MDRC found that almost all programs studied led to earnings and/or employment gains; however, employment and earnings impacts did not occur when resources per eligible individual were too low to provide employment-directed assistance, or when programs were operated in a rural, very weak labor market.[5] MDRC notes that administrators may face trade-offs in meeting JOBS objectives (earnings gains, welfare savings, or reducing long-term dependency). For example, low-cost services may reach greater numbers of people, but achieve less long-term impact.

In Connecticut, the Department of Income Maintenance found several barriers for Puerto Rican families to becoming self-sufficient: JTPA screens out people who are not language proficient; Latino culture encourages women to stay home and care for their children; lack of family support for child care; and lack of family and peer support for self-improvement. Connecticut reorganized the JOBS program and made it more family systems oriented; created contract opportunities with community-based organizations; linked programs with the Department of Labor to blend job placement and family-focused human services; and reorganized the human services program.

A study of the Massachusetts Employment and Training (ET) Choices Program (1987-1990) found that Latinas, despite high participation rates, had poor outcomes for job placement and wages. Job placement for all women was 44 percent; for Latinas it was only 28 percent. (Language was not found to be a factor in placement.) The most successful programs were those which aided the development of English language skills combined with skills and job training programs. However, 66 percent of Latinas were in education-only programs. The report suggested that one reason for the poor outcomes was insufficient resources for community-based organizations (CBOs) to develop integrated programs of skills and training combined with language and literacy education. (CBOs are the typical route of entry for Latinas into the program.)

III. Immigrant and Refugee Programs

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) administers two programs targeted to specific immigrant groups: the SLIAG program for undocumented immigrants legalized under the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act, and the domestic refugee resettlement program, established by the Refugee Act of 1980.

A. HHS State Legalization Impact Assistance Grants (SLIAG)

The Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA) reimbursed states for certain education costs related to undocumented immigrants granted amnesty under the act. In addition, applicants for legalization were

[4]Riccio, James and Friedlander, Daniel. *GAIN: Program Strategies, Participation, Patterns, and First-Year Impacts in Six Counties*, May 1992; and, Friedlander, Daniel; Riccio, James; and Freedman Stephen. *GAIN: Two-Year Impacts in Six Counties*, May 1993, Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, New York.

[5]Gueron, Judith M., *From Welfare To Work: Summary*, Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 1991, New York.

SLIAG in Brief

The Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA) was enacted to control illegal immigration. It established employer sanctions for hiring undocumented people, and granted amnesty to 2.6 million undocumented immigrants already in the United States. These newly legalized immigrants were barred from accessing federal programs such as AFDC and Medicaid for five years. (The bar ended in May 1993.) The State Legalization Impact Assistance Grants (SLIAG) program was created to reimburse states for public assistance, public health, and education costs related to this population during the five-year bar. In an unusual budgeting formula, federal funding of $4 billion was appropriated for FY1988-1991, to be spent by states until FY1994. However, federal budget deficits have led to funding deferrals since 1990. The final appropriation of $812 million is expected to be allocated to states in FY1994.

required to pass an English and citizenship test, entailing a minimum 40 hours of instruction. Services allowed under IRCA are those listed in the Adult Basic Education Act, including the required English language and citizenship training, literacy training, basic education, GED preparation, educational materials, curriculum development, ancillary services such as child care and transportation, and direct and indirect administrative costs. Administrative costs for a state education agency were capped at 1.5 percent.

The SLIAG education funds were not permitted to be used for job training or vocational education, and only limited funds are available for elementary and secondary school students and for adults. IRCA applied the definitions and provisions of the Emergency Immigrant Education Act, thus capping funds to a service provider at $500 per eligible child or adult per year. Funding for grades K-12 is not available for schools with less than 500 eligible individuals or 3 percent of a school district's enrollment.

States were allowed flexibility in allocating SLIAG funds among public assistance, public health, and educational services (with a minimum 10 percent for each category). California used 20 percent of its SLIAG grant or education programs, doubling the state's ESL capacity and eliminating waiting lists for classes. However, when SLIAG funds end, California expects to support only 15 percent of its expanded capacity. Other states have recorded continued high enrollment in adult education classes by this population.

SLIAG funds created a temporary capacity for educational services, but the demand and need for services continues. The English and civics requirement brought hundreds of thousands of people into the educational system for the first time. For example, a California survey of the newly legalized found that one-half were first-time users of educational services. Furthermore, the educational needs of the newly legalized are high. The INS Legalized Population Survey found that legalized aliens had substantially fewer years of education on average (seven years) than U.S. residents (13 years). While 85 percent reported speaking Spanish well, only 15 percent reported speaking English well.

A research project conducted in 1992 for California Community Colleges found that the amnesty population was unique, with different backgrounds and support needs from other groups who receive ESL in California community colleges[6]. The amnesty population's recent arrival to the educational process and their interest in support services suggests a considerable need for assistance in obtaining access to the system. The report recommends continued assessment and adjustment of instructional programs to serve the wide variety

[6]Spicer, Scot L. and Sanchez, Jorge R. *Caught in the Shadows: Immigrant Educational Access -- The Amnesty Population.* (Glendale Community College, Calif., April 1992).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of educational backgrounds and ethnic diversity of the state's rapidly growing ESL population. The report also recommends programs that can educate immigrant parents and children together, providing educational opportunities for both adults and children and minimizing the inter-generational conflict of two languages and two cultures within the family.

B. HHS Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR)

The Office of Refugee Resettlement within HHS is the agency responsible for domestic resettlement assistance for refugees. Two ORR programs allow states to use funds for employment and training: the Social Services program and the Targeted Assistance program.

A third program provides matching grants (up to $1,000 per refugee) to voluntary agencies for employment services, English language instruction, social adjustment services, food, and housing during a refugee's first four months in the United States. Refugees served by this program may access publicly funded medical assistance and other services.

ORR has also instituted demonstration programs funded from the social services appropriation ($12.5 million in FY 1992). This includes the Wilson/Fish Demonstration projects and the national discretionary projects (such as the Key States Initiative and Job Links).

1. Social Services

The Refugee Act permits states to use funds in this program for a broad range of services, including any service allowable in a state's plan under Title XX of the Social Security Act, plus services allowed by ORR such as English language training, job development and placement, career counseling, vocational training, child care, and translation and interpreter services. However, ORR requires that if a state's refugee welfare utilization rate is 55 percent or more, 85 percent of social service funds must be used for English language training, vocational training, employment counseling, and job placement. The limitation does not apply if the social services plan was established by or in consultation with local governments, and provides for the maximum appropriate provision for employability services. The remaining 15 percent may be used for orientation, social adjustment and translation, transportation, day care and other state Title XX services. Awards are made to states based on per capita arrivals for the previous three years. In 1992, Congress appropriated $83 million for the social services line item. ORR allocated $67 million to states; $3.5 million was earmarked for refugee associations; and $12.5 million was used by ORR for discretionary social service programs.

2. Targeted Assistance Program

The Targeted Assistance program funds employment and other services for refugees and entrants in "high-impact" areas, e.g., counties with large refugee or entrant populations, a high proportion of refugees or entrants to the overall population, and high public assistance use. The goal is to assist refugees to obtain employment within one year. Eighty-five percent of the funds must be used for employment-related services (vocational English, on-the-job training, job placement). In 1992, $49 million was allocated for targeted assistance activities for refugees and entrants. Ninety percent was awarded to 20 states for 44 qualifying counties facing extraordinary resettlement problems; 10 percent was awarded to localities in 22 states most heavily affected by refugees such as Laotian Hmong, Cambodians, and Soviet Pentecostals, including secondary migrants.

An example of a successful program funded by Targeted Assistance is the Jeffco Employment and Training Services program in Golden, Colo., funded since 1986, and awarded a County Achievement Award from the National Association of Counties. Laurie Bagan, the state refugee coordinator, notes that refugees tend to have many employment barriers: low English skills, cultural differences, lack of training and experience, limited access to transportation, and lack of knowledge of the community and resources. The program's goal is to coordinate

services among agencies and increase refugee access to existing programs. The program provides comprehensive and centralized services, including classroom training, work training experience, and support services such as day care and translation.

3. Demonstration Programs and Discretionary Projects

a. Wilson/Fish Demonstration Projects

In 1984 Congress directed HHS to examine alternative resettlement strategies for the delivery of cash assistance, social services, and case management to assist refugees make the transition from public assistance to self-sufficiency. Demonstration projects received no additional allocations; programs are funded from existing cash and medical assistance grants and social services grants.

The Oregon Refugee Early Employment Project (REEP), begun in 1985, is an alternative employment project to the mainstream refugee resettlement effort. It serves refugees ineligible for AFDC or SSI. REEP services are "front-loaded," that is, services are concentrated on the refugee immediately after arrival in the United States. The program integrates services (language training, pre-employment training, job placement, child care, transportation) and provides linkages between service providers. (It is staff intensive, with only one caseworker for 35 cases.)

The REEP goals are early employment and increased self-sufficiency with cost savings to the program. An evaluation by the Refugee Policy Group found that REEP reached its objective of placing 75 percent of its employable clients in full-time permanent employment within 18 months of arrival in the United States. Family self-sufficiency (family earnings exceeding program income standards) was not achieved; a single wage earner at minimum wage could not support a family. It was hoped that future earnings would be higher as the earner gained work experience, or the family was supported by multiple wage earners. Cost savings of 18.5 percent were achieved over a three-year period. A follow-up review in 1991 noted that despite changes in caseload and reduced program length, REEP still showed that most refugees became employed within nine months of arrival.

Key components of the program are: cash assistance, case management, and employment services contracted to three voluntary agencies and a consortium of refugee associations; and medical assistance provided to all low-income clients through a full service medical provider. The program is monitored by Oregon state officials.

Other Wilson/Fish programs include a U.S. Catholic Conference demonstration project in San Diego, a grant to the Cuban Exodus Relief Fund and demonstration projects with Alaska Refugee Outreach and in the state of Kentucky. (The California Refugee Demonstration Project existed from 1985-90.)

b. National Discretionary Projects

ORR allocated $12.5 million in FY 1992 for six programs directed toward improving employment opportunities for refugees: 1) the Key States/Counties Initiative aims to increase employment and reduce welfare dependency among targeted populations in New York, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Washington, Massachusetts, and Michigan (funded at a total of $2.5 million), and in Los Angeles County and Orange County ($400,000 total, funded under Targeted Assistance); 2) Job Links ($3.6 million) provides supplementary social service funds to 30 states with good resettlement opportunities to link refugees with jobs; 3) Planned Secondary Resettlement ($1.2 million) provides opportunity for unemployed refugees to relocate to communities with favorable employment prospects; 4) the Amerasian Initiative ($2.8 million) assists in resettlement of Amerasians and families; 5) Microenterprise Development Initiative ($1.3 million) to promote small business and self-employment among refugees; and 6) $1 million to 24 states and California counties for the special needs of Vietnamese re-education camp detainees.

IV. Discussion

Coordination

A multiplicity of programs exist for employment and training. At the federal level, the GAO found 125 programs spending $16.3 billion to train adults and out-of-school youth, under the supervision of 14 federal departments or agencies. In Massachusetts, the National Commission for Employment Policy found 31 training programs funded at $320 million in FY 1992: 13 funded by the federal government, nine by the state, and six funded jointly by federal and state government (two were funded by other sources and information was unavailable for the adult education program). Of 31 programs, five provided 67 percent of the funds: JOBS, 26 percent; Vocational Rehabilitation of Massachusetts, 14 percent; JTPA II-A, 11 percent; Department of Mental Retardation, 10 percent; and Employment Services, 6 percent. An estimated 422,000 people were served.

As one method of maximizing dollars in a time of scarce resources, programs have been urged, or mandated, to coordinate services with other programs. Both JOBS and JTPA contain this type of language. Program coordination alone, however, cannot make up for the overwhelming demand for employment and training services. Nor does it answer how mainstream programs, attempting to serve a broad range of disadvantaged people, can serve those functioning at low literacy levels and/or those without adequate English language skills.

In the field, practitioners contend that they face "one-way coordination"; for example, no directives exist to require educational agencies to coordinate with JTPA. In addition, conflicting eligibility requirements and definitions of "economically disadvantaged" prohibit meaningful coordination of policies and programs. Uniform terms and definitions would simplify program administration for both agencies and clients, for intake, assessment, planning, and evaluation.

Some areas have attempted to address this issue. For example, New Jersey has established a "super council" to streamline planning and delivery of employment and training programs. Created from the JTPA State Job Training Coordinating Council, the new State Employment and Training Commission makes policy recommendations to the governor on JTPA, Carl Perkins Vocational Education, Wagner-Peyser employment service, JOBS, and state programs. Since its creation, New Jersey has consolidated its education and training programs from 64 to 15, with a projected savings of $6 million over 18 months.

The Minnesota Interagency Adult Learning Council encourages those at the local level to coordinate services, for example, using a common intake form for welfare, employment and training, and community services. A 1985 law encouraged agencies to co-locate for one-stop shopping.

In California, if a county is already able to serve all AFDC participants, it may use federal refugee funds to set up employment programs or language classes for refugees within GAIN (California's JOBS program). State legislation allows counties to set up a parallel system to streamline a program for newly arrived refugees. In Tacoma, Wash., El Centro de Latino developed a collaborative program to provide ESL to Hispanics, particularly adults. It is supported with a variety of resources: city funds, school district funds and assistance in establishing an alternative high school, a grant from the Department of Labor, and assistance from Microsoft, Nintendo and IBM. The computer companies created a computer lab to train people in data processing and computer skills, and also established a family learning center for ESL.

In Atlanta, Ga., the Atlanta Private Industry Council (PIC) collaborates with Georgia State University to offer a Vocational English as a Second Language program to accommodate participants who do not have the skills necessary to enter the PIC's vocational training. The project is funded with JTPA education and coordination grant funds. This program serves Title II-C youth and operates 6 months each year.

Mainstreaming vs. Targeted Programs

Participants in the Immigrant Policy Project's regional meetings examined the possibility of adapting "mainstream" programs that command larger resources, such as JTPA, to address the unique needs of refugees and immigrants. Research studies have demonstrated the high level of participation by immigrants in the workforce; refugees and some immigrants, however, need transitional assistance to facilitate their entry into the labor market. These newcomers generally need the same kinds of services that other disadvantaged populations need, with the unique requirement for English language instruction and cultural adjustment. For example, refugees need ESL classes, vocational/technical training, culturally specific employment and training, and support services (such as day care, counseling, and medical assistance). However, few refugees end up in mainstream programs and state-local resources are insufficient. Provided sufficient funds remain for targeted programs, these resources could be used to leverage mainstream programs and improve access by immigrants.

An argument against the creation of "targeted" populations is that it often becomes a screening device rather than a mechanism for inclusion. If programs serve only 5-10 percent of the eligible population, then 90-95 percent must be excluded, or turned away, from services. The current system is a patchwork of employment and training programs for specific populations with many holes and little coordination of services, eligibility requirements, or bureaucracies.

Other participants argued that mainstream programs are not equipped to accommodate the special language and cultural differences of immigrants, and that programs are still needed for those that do not qualify for mainstream services. In Minnesota, for example, the JTPA and refugee programs are operated separately to handle language, cultural, and discrimination issues.

In JTPA and other mainstream programs, refugees or other immigrants may not have as high a priority as other "targeted" groups for services. To focus attention on the needs of refugees and immigrants, policymakers may work within the SDA/PIC structure where most determinations on client groups are made; or state legislation can establish priorities for JTPA, even at the SDA level. At the state level, recommendations and information on the needs of refugees and immigrants should be provided to the federally mandated boards such as the State Job Training Coordinating Council, the AFDC/JOBS Board, the Unemployment Insurance Board, and the Vocational Education Board. (Under 1992 JTPA amendments, states have the option to combine planning and delivery of employment and training programs under Human Resource Investment Councils.)

Job Corps, as a comprehensive, integrated provider of training, remedial education, health care, counseling, and support services may be a useful model or service deliverer for refugees and immigrants.

La Cooperativa, a Sacramento-based coalition of five organizations (including CET) that has trained low-income people for 25 years, observes that workforce development as a national issue is a serious problem. Eighty-two percent of the newly legalized population works, but public policy is geared toward dependent poor people and does not build on the strong work ethic of this population. While this population could fit into the community college system in California, they probably won't because of their low educational levels and difficulty in accessing public institutions.

Licensing of Foreign-born Professionals

An unexpected finding was the need to address U.S. certification and licensing requirements for foreign-born professionals. Highly educated refugees and immigrants are encountering barriers entering the workforce because foreign credentials don't transfer easily to the United States. In some areas, states and localities have developed programs to assist foreign-trained professionals with U.S. accreditation, for example, to alleviate physician and nursing shortages. PHASE was established in 1988 and funded by the New York City Department of

Employment, in collaboration with the city Health and Hospitals Corporation and the state Office of Mental Health. PHASE assists immigrant professionals to become licensed or certified in occupations when a shortage has been documented in health or human services fields.

In testimony before the New York Legislative Commission on Skills Development and Vocational Education, Dr. Rosa Gil of PHASE stated that barriers to immigrant participation in the workforce include inadequate knowledge of professional credentialing requirements in the state, and unfamiliarity with U.S. testing methods. She recommended funding for ethnic community-based organizations to provide orientation, training and employment services; innovative on-the-job training for Hispanic, Asian and Caribbean immigrants; and information for immigrant professionals on licensing, education and training programs, case management services, and employment services.

In Virginia, state officials are examining the possibility of licensing reciprocity with other states and the establishment of uniform standards for the health profession.

Florida established the following guidelines for physician certification. Any foreign doctor may become a physician's assistant if he or she: 1) practiced in his or her home country; 2) resided in Florida for three years before entering the program; 3) attended one year at the University of Miami; 4) and has one year of supervised practice by a Florida doctor.

Brown University has a one-to-one program for engineers that uses technologically specific English training and includes preparation for certification. In Chicago, a nonprofit organization provides training in both English and medical classes to pass the nursing certification (funded by SLIAG). This provides refugees with a guaranteed job as a bilingual medical professional. Another group provides scholarships to bilingual substance abuse counselors to pursue the two-year certification process.

The New York Association of New Americans (NYANA) developed an initiative to retrain Soviet-trained nurses and help them pass the New York licensing exam by providing remediation in English with additional nursing instruction. This program fulfilled two objectives by providing employment for foreign-trained professionals and addressing a severe labor shortage of nurses in the city. The initiative continues as the New York State Health Transition Initiative with resources provided by the New York departments of social services, education, and health.

Eligibility for Services

The proliferation of immigration categories and differing eligibility for services created by the federal government has confused and complicated the delivery of services to those who need them. Dr. Philip Martin of UC-Davis writes of "mixed families" created by the 1986 amnesty program, particularly for the agricultural workers. How should social policy deal with a family containing a legalized father (temporarily barred from services), unauthorized mother and children (ineligible for most services), and U.S.-citizen children (eligible for all services)? This is compounded by varying eligibility requirements in federal programs.

Georges Vernez of RAND recommends that the federal government standardize requirements for existing federal, social, and other entitlement programs for which immigrants are eligible. At the local level where services must be provided, many believe that distinctions of legal status are irrelevant: a person without a job, whether legal, refugee, or other, still needs assistance, but federal benefits are often lacking.

Communication Issues

In general, there is a shortage of interpreters, translators, bilingual teachers, ESL teachers, and ESL classes. Paul Hill of the RAND Corporation, in a discussion of newcomers in American schools, notes that the teacher supply is the greatest limiting factor in meeting the needs of immigrant students. Other unmet needs include texts and instructional materials, adult education

for older immigrant students, and incentives for teacher mobility and training.

In Illinois community colleges, 45 percent of students are limited English proficient, but only 3 percent of the adult education budget is for ESL. There are insufficient teachers and number of hours provided for adult ESL classes. In California, CET has served 50,000 people in its English language classes through SLIAG funds; with the end of the program in sight, no replacement funds have been found to meet the enormous need. CET notes that the two components that offer long term benefit for the amnesty population are language development integrated with employment and training. The New York Association for New Americans (NYANA) notes that for Soviet refugees in their program the single most important determinant of their ability to obtain work is the ability to communicate in English.

We need and don't have a well-coordinated system that addresses language education and vocational training. The National Center for Research in Vocational Education states in a recent report that the long-term language instruction needs of immigrants are not provided for. Many immigrants cannot meet the ability-to-benefit testing criteria of JTPA or JOBS. The lack of bilingual training or support services is a barrier to the participation of immigrants in JOBS and JTPA. Finally, programs tend to "cream" at admission, choosing students most likely to become employed, because reimbursement is based on high job placement rates.

Availability of Services

Vernez writes that immigrants' demand for adult education (literacy, English, and vocational education) may be outstripping the ability of states and districts to provide. He states, "Adult education has been, and continues to be, the most-neglected area of education, not only for immigrants, but for all adults." The future economic prospects of the newly legalized depend on access to basic adult education; for example, nearly two-thirds have such low proficiency in English they would have difficulties functioning in other than entry-level jobs, in most job training programs, and in the community.

Local jurisdictions are finding it increasingly difficult to pay for immigrant services. Vernez finds this pattern: "The fiscal burden of immigrants increases as the size of the jurisdiction decreases, ranging from neutral or even positive at the national level, to neutral to negative at the state level, to negative at the local (county/city) level." Vernez recommends targeted federal funds for those communities most affected by new immigrants and their children, primarily for educational institutions—from early childhood to K-12, adult education, and community colleges.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The high immigration levels of the 1980s have been widely publicized: nearly 9 million newcomers accounted for one-third of the nation's net population growth. What has been less well considered is the Department of Labor's projection that immigrants will become a significant proportion of the nation's workforce.

These changing demographics will require some rethinking of the delivery of education, employment, and training to traditional and nontraditional U.S. workers. The existing employment and training programs form a fragmented system, lacking adequate funds or resources. JTPA and JOBS programs have shown some success, but serve only a small percentage of the eligible population, and effectively discourage access by immigrants and refugees. The SLIAG program, which created temporary capacity for educating the newly legalized, is anticipated to end in September 1994. No preparations have been made to meet the continued demand for services of the 2.5 million newly legalized. The refugee program, which provides short-term employment services to a small portion of newcomers, has faced repeated funding cuts in recent years, and is again up for reauthorization and reform in 1994.

In a related arena, President Clinton promised to "end welfare as we know it" and replace it with a

new system of welfare to work. Addressing the needs of the nonnative eligible public assistance recipients will be a challenge in federal, state, and local welfare reform efforts. Many Washington-based immigrant policy specialists have been surprised to answer federal inquiries on barriers of immigrants to family self-sufficiency. Refugees and immigrants, while still a small portion of AFDC recipients nationwide, confront unique barriers, particularly those of language and culture. However, many of the needs of immigrants and refugees are the same as other low-income families. Support services such as health care and child care are essential to a family's sustained independence from welfare.

A new social contract is being created between mainstream public assistance recipients and the government, giving each responsibilities. Government's side of the bargain is to ensure that the appropriate program support—such as classes in English as a second language, bilingual educators, and acculturation within government programs and the workplace—is available to support the welfare-to-work transition for targeted as well as mainstream populations.

As policymakers at federal, state, and local levels craft reforms of their welfare, education, employment and training programs for improved self-sufficiency and workforce skills, the requirements of a growing immigrant population will need to be examined and addressed. Successful practices within the programs discussed in this paper should not be overlooked; for example, combined language and vocational training, comprehensive services such as Job Corps, and coordinated services that address family self-sufficiency. In order to compete in today's global economy, the United States must invest in its most valuable asset, its workforce.

SOURCES

Abt Associates Inc. *The National JTPA Study: Title II-A Impacts on Earnings and Employment at 18 Months.* Bethesda, Md.: May 1992.

American Public Welfare Association. "State Views on AFDC, JOBS Issues," *W-Memo.* January 1992, pp. 9-20.

California Assembly Office of Research. *Ready or Not, Here We Come: Training California's Emerging Workforce.* Sacramento, Calif.: June 1990.

Friedlander, Daniel; Riccio, James; and Freedman Stephen. *GAIN: Two-Year Impacts in Six Counties.* New York, N.Y.: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, May 1993.

Gueron, Judith M. *From Welfare To Work: Summary.* New York, N.Y.: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 1991.

Handelman, Mark, and Miller, Alfred P. "Vocational Services in Soviet Jewish Resettlement: The Challenge for the Nineties", *Journal of Jewish Communal Service.* Winter 1990, Vol. 67, No. 2.

Liddell, Scott. "New Jersey's Super Council Coordinates Workforce Development," *NCSL Legisbrief.* Vol 1, No. 16, April 1993.

Martin, Dr. Philip. "Farm Labor in California: Past, Present, and Future." October 1992.

Martin, Dr. Philip. "NAFTA, Migration, and U.S. Labor Markets," *The Employment Effects of the North American Free Trade Agreement: Recommendations and Background Studies,* September 29, 1992.

Meisenheimer, Joseph R., II. "How Do Immigrants Fare in the U.S. Labor M arket?", *Monthly Labor Review.* December 1992.

National Commission for Employment Policy. *Assessing State-Level Job Training Coordination: A Survey Design and Methodology Based Upon the Massachusetts Experience,* Research Report No. 92-01. December 1992.

National Governors' Association. "Side by Side Comparison of the Job Training Partnership Act Before and After the 1992 Amendments." *Legisline.* October 1992.

National Immigration Law Center. *Guide to Alien Eligibility for Federal Programs.* Los Angeles, California: 1992.

Ramsey, Kimberly, and Robyn, Abby. *Preparing Adult Immigrants for Work: The Educational Response in Two Communities.* National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California, Berkeley. #N-3586-NCRVE/UBC/RC, published by RAND 1992.

Refugee Policy Group. *The Refugee Early Employment Project: An Evaluation.* Washington, D.C.: August 1989.

Refugee Policy Group. *The Refugee Early Employment Project: A Revisit.* Washington, D.C.: May 19, 1991.

Riccio, James, and Friedlander, Daniel. *GAIN: Program Strategies, Participation, Patterns, and First-Year Impacts in Six Counties*, New York, N.Y.: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, May 1992.

Rothman, Eric S., and Espenshade, Thomas J. "Fiscal Impacts of Immigration to the United States", *Population Index*, Fall 1992, Vol. 58, No. 3.

Spicer, Scot L., and Sanchez, Jorge R. *Caught in the Shadows: Immigrant Educational Access—The Amnesty Population*. Glendale Community College, Calif.: April 1992.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Refugee Resettlement. *Refugee Resettlement Program: Report to the Congress*. Washington, D.C. January 31, 1993 (Annual Report FY1992)

U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means. *Overview of Entitlement Programs: 1993 Green Book*. 103d Congress, 1st sess., July 7, 1993.

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of International Labor Affairs. *The Effects of Immigration on the U.S. Economy and Labor Market, Immigration Policy and Research Report 1*, 1989.

U.S. General Accounting Office. *Job Training Partnership Act: Racial and Gender Disparities in Services*. GAO/HRD-91-148. September 1991.

U.S. General Accounting Office. *Job Training Partnership Act: Actions Needed to Improve Participant Support Services*. GAO/HRD-92-124. June 12, 1992.

Uriarte, Miren. *Latinas in the Massachusetts Employment and Training (ET) Choices Program*. University of Massachusetts in collaboration with the Department of Public Welfare. 1992.

Vernez, Georges. *Needed: A Federal Role in Helping Communities Cope with Immigration*. RAND Program for Research on Immigration Policy. RAND/RP-177. Santa Monica, Calif.: 1993.

Vialet, Joyce, and Eig, Larry. "Alien Eligibility Requirements for Major Federal Assistance Programs." *CRS Report for Congress*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, August 1, 1989.

Vialet, Joyce, and Eig, Larry. "Alien Eligibility for Federal Assistance." *CRS Report for Congress* Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, April 27, 1993.

America's Newcomers

Employment and Training Programs for Immigrants and Refugees

Immigrants are a growing proportion of the American workforce: the U.S. Department of Labor predicts that by the year 2000 nearly one-fourth of new workers will be immigrants. Many of the immigrants have limited skill in English and a low level of schooling, a fact that has serious implications for the nation's current employment and training system.

Now that a multilingual, multiethnic workforce is a reality in the United States, state and local policymakers must consider how these legal residents can become productive members of their adopted communities and contribute to the nation's goal of a competitive workforce.

This report outlines the provisions of the Job Training Partnership Act, the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program, and the two U.S. Health and Human Services programs for newly legalized immigrants and refugees. It includes recent evaluations of these programs and examples of successful programs that serve the foreign-born.

The Immigrant Policy Project

The Immigrant Policy Project of the State and Local Coalition on Immigration is a collaboration of five national organizations representing state and local government:

American Public Welfare Association
National Association of Counties
National Conference of State Legislatures
National Governors' Association
United States Conference of Mayors

The project is funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to address the role of state and local governments in the resettlement of refugees and immigrants. Other issue papers of the project examine immigration trends and their effect on state and local government; health care issues; and community relations.

State and Local Coalition on Immigration
Immigrant Policy Project

APWA

NATIONAL GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION

National Association of Counties

BEST COPY AVAILABLE